

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

ROY TROST, *also known as* Daisy Lynne  
 Meadows,

Plaintiff,

v.

NETHANJAH CHILDERS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:22-CV-00383-MMD-CLB

**ORDER DENYING MISCELLANEOUS  
 MOTIONS**

[ECF Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28]

Before the Court are several motions filed by Plaintiff: (1) special motion for prisoner release order, ECF No. 25; (2) motion request for a three-judge court, ECF No. 26; (3) motion to file all further filings under seal, ECF No. 27; and (4) motion to suppress, ECF No. 28. These motions are improper for several reasons.

First, it is unclear what specific relief Plaintiff seeks through the motions. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure require that all motions filed with the Court state with particularity the grounds for seeking the order and the relief sought. Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b)(1)(B)-(C). Second, the defendants have yet to be served in this case, so at a minimum any motions are premature. Next, as to the motion to file further filings under seal and motion to suppress, these motions do not contain a points and authorities in support of the motion. LR 7-2(d). In sum, these motions are improper and must be denied.

Plaintiff is advised that the filing of frivolous and legally unsupported motions is forbidden by the Local Rules of Practice and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court has a heavy docket. Plaintiff's case is just one of hundreds before the Court, and these frivolous filings slow the pace of the litigation. They also place Plaintiff at risk of sanctions.

At this early juncture, the Court will be lenient because Plaintiff is a *pro se* party. However, Plaintiff is advised that her status as an inmate does not give her a blank check to clutter the docket. See *Schenker v. Rowley*, No. 3:12-cv-00174-LRH-VPC, 2013 WL 321688, at \*3-4, 5-6 (D. Nev. Jan. 28, 2013). The Court takes judicial notice that Plaintiff

1 has filed and litigated cases in federal court before; therefore, she cannot claim ignorance  
2 of applicable procedural rules and standards by which she must abide. Plaintiff is further  
3 reminded that she is obligated to follow General Order No. 2021-05, which sets forth  
4 certain requirements and limitations for filings in Pro Se Inmate Non-Habeas Civil Rights  
5 cases, including motions.

6 Accordingly, Plaintiff's miscellaneous motions, (ECF Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28), are  
7 **DENIED.**

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9 **DATED:** July 11, 2023.

10   
11 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**